



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/974,982	10/11/2001	Kenneth Ray Banning	AUS920010691US1	8110

44994 7590 06/27/2005

IBM CORPORATION (DWL)
C/O LALLY & LALLY, L.L.P.
P. O. BOX 684749
AUSTIN, TX 78768-4749

EXAMINER

LESNIEWSKI, VICTOR D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2152

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/974,982

Applicant(s)

BANNING ET AL.

Examiner

Victor Lesniewski

Art Unit

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 and 28-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 and 28-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed 4/7/2005 has been placed of record in the file.
2. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-16, and 18-24 have been amended.
3. Claims 25-27 have been canceled.
4. Claims 28-30 have been added.
5. Claims 1-24 and 28-30 are now pending.
6. The applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24 and 28-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the following new grounds of rejection.

Response to Amendment

7. Claim 1, and like claims, has been amended to show a determination of whether a client has previously accessed a document that provides context for a requested document. The amendment proves a change in scope to the independent claim as the independent claim now explicitly states determining whether the client has access authority to the requested document by determining whether the client has previously accessed a document providing context for the requested document. However, none of the amended claims show a patentable distinction over the prior art as evidenced by the following new grounds of rejection.
8. Independent claim 19 has been amended only to adjust the wording of the claim. The scope of the claim has not changed. No arguments have been set forth in the applicant's remarks as to why the applicant believes claim 19 to be allowable over the prior art of record. Thus, claims 19 and 23 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over van Hoff

Art Unit: 2152

(U.S. Patent Number 6,381,631) in view of Fernandez et al., "An Abstract Authorization System for the Internet," as discussed in the previous office action.

9. Since the applicant discusses claim 19 in relation to claim 1 in the remarks and states that analogous arguments apply to "amended independent claim 19," it is believed that the applicant meant to amend claim 19 in a fashion similar to amended claim 1, but inadvertently did not. Thus, claims 19 and 23 will also appear in the claim listing below for the new grounds of rejection. If claim 19 was to be amended similarly to claim 1, claims 19 and 23 would be rejected as stated below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claims 1, 5-10, 14-18, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Antcliff et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,081,835), hereinafter referred to as Antcliff. Claims 19 and 23, on condition of amendment as discussed above, are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Antcliff.

12. Some claims will be discussed together. Those claims which are essentially the same except that they set forth the claimed invention as a computer program product or a server are rejected under the same rationale applied to the described claim.

13. Antcliff has disclosed:

- <Claims 1, 10, and 19>

A method of processing a request from a client for a document from a server in a data processing network, comprising: determining whether the requested document is context restricted (column 4, lines 49-51 and 58-63); responsive to determining that the requested document is context restricted, determining whether the client has access authority to the requested document by determining whether the client has previously accessed a document providing context for the requested document (column 4, line 63 through column 5, line 15); and responsive to determining that the client lacks access authority, responding to the client request by returning a version of the requested document that differs from a version returned to a client having access authority (column 5, lines 24-26).

- <Claims 5, 14, and 23>

The method of claim 1, wherein determining whether the client has access authority includes determining whether the client has indirect access authority (column 5, lines 8-15).

- <Claims 6, 15, and 24>

The method of claim 5, wherein the client request comprises an HTTP formatted request and further wherein determining whether the client has indirect access authority includes comparing information in a referer field in a header of the request to information in a table of authorized referrers accessible to the server (column 5, lines 8-23).

Art Unit: 2152

- <Claims 7 and 16>

The method of claim 6, wherein determining whether the client has been referred by a third party server comprises determining whether the request matches at least one entry in a table of authorized referrers (column 5, lines 18-21).

- <Claims 8 and 17>

The method of claim 7, wherein the request header field comprises a referrer header field of an HTTP request and wherein the table of authorized referrers is stored in permanent storage to which the server has access (column 5, lines 8-23).

- <Claims 9 and 18>

The method of claim 1, wherein returning a version of the requested document that differs includes retrieving the requested document and running an application to insert a visibly detectable notice indicating that the requested document is being viewed out of context (column 5, lines 24-28).

Since all the limitations of the invention as set forth in claims 1, 5-10, 14-19, 23, and 24 were disclosed by Antcliff, claims 1, 5-10, 14-19, 23, and 24 are rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2152

15. Claims 2-4, 11-13, 20-22, and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Antcliff, as applied above, in view of Rangarajan et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,510,439), hereinafter referred to as Rangarajan.

16. Antcliff disclosed a method for controlling a server wherein a user must have access authority in order for the server to send certain web pages to the user's web browser. In an analogous art, Rangarajan disclosed a state management server that allows users to access different versions of documents only if they have access rights to a particular version.

17. Concerning claims 2, 11, and 20, Antcliff did not explicitly state determining whether cookie information in the request indicates that the client has previously accessed the document providing context for the requested document. However, Rangarajan does explicitly disclose this feature as his system grants access to documents based on state information stored in a cookie. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system of Antcliff by adding the ability to determine whether cookie information in the request indicates that the client has previously accessed the document providing context for the requested document as provided by Rangarajan. Here the combination satisfies the need for a server which supports a flexible definition of a logical session. See Rangarajan, column 2, lines 28-33. This rationale also applies to new claim 28 which states similar limitations. This rationale also applies to those dependent claims utilizing the same combination.

18. Thereby, the combination of Antcliff and Rangarajan discloses:

- <Claims 2, 11, and 20>

The method of claim 1, wherein determining whether the client has previously accessed a document providing context for the requested document includes determining whether cookie information in the request indicates that the client has previously accessed the document providing context for the requested document (Rangarajan, column 7, lines 31-39 and column 8, line 63 through column 9, line 9).

- <Claims 3, 12, 21, and 30>

The method of claim 2, wherein the client request comprises an HTTP formatted request and further wherein determining whether the cookie information indicates that the client has previously accessed the document providing context comprises determining whether the cookie information includes directory path information for the requested document (Rangarajan, column 7, lines 6-11 and 45-51, and column 8, line 63 through column 9, line 9).

- <Claims 4, 13, 22, and 29>

The method of claim 3, wherein the cookie information is sent to the client when the client views a document or set of documents that provide the required context for the requested document (Rangarajan, column 7, lines 39-44).

- <Claim 28>

A computer program product comprising instructions for processing an HTTP request from a client for a requested document from a server in a data processing network, the instruction being embedded on a computer readable medium, comprising: instructions for determining whether the first document is a context restricted document wherein a

Art Unit: 2152

context restricted document is accessible only after accessing a preceding document (Antcliff, column 4, lines 49-51 and column 4, line 58 through column 5, line 7); instructions, responsive to determining that the requested document is a context restricted document, for processing cookie information in the client request to determine whether the client has accessed the preceding document (Rangarajan, column 7, lines 31-39 and column 8, line 63 through column 9, line 9); and instructions for responding to the client request by returning a first version of the requested document responsive to determining from the cookie information that the client has accessed the preceding document and for responding to the client request by returning a second version of the requested document responsive to determining from the cookie information that the client has not accessed the preceding document (Rangarajan, column 3, lines 9-33).

Since the combination of Antcliff and Rangarajan discloses all of the above limitations, claims 2-4, 11-13, 20-22, and 28-30 are rejected.

Conclusion

19. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure.

- McDonough et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,991,878) disclosed a method for controlling access to information in a distributed computing system using cookies.
- Anupam et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,070,185) disclosed a server system that provides customer service over the Internet using a customer cookie.

- Rosenfelt et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,496,822) disclosed a method for providing a computer system with an authorized access identifier that allows access to a restricted access database.

20. The applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). The applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Victor Lesniewski whose telephone number is 571-272-3987. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2152

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Victor Lesniewski
Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 2152



Dung C. Dinh
Primary Examiner